



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

A NEW COMMENTARY ON GENESIS

This volume¹ is the first of a new series of commentaries on the Old Testament under the general direction of E. Sellin. The aim of the new series is to provide more exhaustive commentary treatment than any of the recent German series furnishes. This is to be a *Kommentar*, not a *Hand-Kommentar*, nor a *Hand-buch*—much less a *Kurzer Hand-Kommentar*. The standpoint of the series is that of historicocritical scholarship of a somewhat conservative type. The proposed contributors are Alt, Buhl, Caspary, Herrmann, Hölscher, Kittel, König, Lotz, Procksch, Rothstein, Stärk, Volz, Wilke, and the editor. The scope of the commentary is in general that of the “International Critical Series,” but its attitude toward critical questions will probably be on the whole much more conservative.

There is no dearth of commentaries on Genesis. With Dillmann, Delitzsch, Gunkel, Holzinger, Driver, and Skinner on the market, a new applicant for public favor must show good excuse for its existence. This commentary does not make any such contribution to the study of Genesis as did Gunkel; but the opportunities for that sort of a piece of work are relatively scarce. Procksch gives us a good scholarly commentary, which is not satisfied with repeating the commonly held opinions. The form of presentation itself is new, in that the text of Genesis is not treated continuously by chapter and verse, but each document is taken in turn, being printed as a continuous narrative. First comes the translation of, and commentary upon, the entire J document; then E and P follow in their turn. A chapter-and-verse index partly overcomes the inconvenience in finding passages that this involves. The advantage of reading and studying each document as a continuous whole far outweighs the slight extra trouble. In his chronological assignment of the sources, Procksch departs somewhat from the common view, placing J in the tenth century and E between 843 and 745 B.C. J and E go back, not to earlier written sources, but to unwritten, oral

¹ *Die Genesis übersetzt und erklärt* [Kommentar zum Alten Testament, herausgegeben von Ernst Sellin. Band I]. Von Otto Procksch. Leipzig: Deichert, 1913. Pp. xii+530. M. 12.50.

tradition. The historical sections of P which appear in Genesis are to be dated not later than the last decades before the exile. These three sources maintained their independence until the days of the exile, at which time they were brought together into one narrative. These views were first suggested by Procksch in his *Elohim-quelle* (1906).

In the much-discussed field of historicity, Procksch defends the personality of Abraham and Joseph, but is willing to call Isaac, Israel, and Jacob tribal personifications. He likewise places himself on the side of those who hold that Israel was not a unit before the Conquest, for he maintains that only the Rachel tribes went down into Egypt, while the Leah tribes remained in Palestine. Moses' work at a later period therefore was that of reintroducing Yahweh, the god of the old original group, to the Rachel tribes.

In the treatment of so many and so various topics as fall within the scope of a commentary on Genesis there is abundant opportunity for difference of opinion and for the creeping in of error. This commentary stands the test of close examination well. The Septuagint is made use of in a thoroughly critical way. The difficulty of recovering the original Septuagint text is fully recognized and an effort is made to overcome it. Here good use is made of the results of the author's work in his *Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta* (1910). A disappointing feature of the commentary is the fact that Sievers is followed in his treatment of the text of Genesis as poetry. Consequently such prosaic passages as 5:1-19; 20:1-16, and 50:1-22 are scanned and clauses are not infrequently dropped as glosses mainly because they are superfluous to the "metre." It is interesting to find that, whereas Eerdmans made the E document polytheistic, in part upon the basis of the use of the plural form אֱלֹהִים, Procksch claims strictly monotheistic views for E upon the basis of the same word. It would require much more evidence to convince us of the monotheism of E. The statement that the custom of cutting themselves in the course of the ritual practiced by the prophets of Baal was not known among the Hebrews is rather questionable in view of the prohibitions of such cutting contained in the law. The derivation of Judah from *Jahawadd* = "Yahweh has guided" is ingenious and from some points of view attractive. But the root *wadd* is unknown otherwise in Hebrew and the formation has no exact parallel; it really involves the total loss of the syllable *wa*. The corresponding formation *Jahuwada^c* yields the form Jehoiadah. But Procksch's conviction that Yahweh antedated Moses in the affection of Israel seems well grounded, the Kenite hypothesis to the contrary notwithstanding.

The proofreading is good, but in this kind of work slips are inevitable. In the second edition, for which we hope, the following corrections should be made: p. x, 2d column, l. 2, read "versio" for "version"; l. 3, read "massoreticus" for "nasoreticus"; l. 11, read "Winckler" for "Winkler"; l. 17, read "Inscriptionum" for "Inscriptionem"; p. 10, note 31, read "Blayne" for "Blaynay"; p. 51, middle, dele bracket before "Nestle"; p. 291, l. 8 (from bottom), read "Kadesh-barnea" for "Kadesh-Carma"; p. 421, l. 2 (from bottom), read "durchdrang" for "durchrang"; p. 524, note 2, read "und" for "nud"; p. 423, l. 9 (from bottom), read *οὐπανοῦ* for *οὐπανοῦ*.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

OXFORD STUDIES IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

The members of Professor Sanday's seminar in the Synoptic problem have united in a volume of essays dealing with various aspects of the problem.¹ These papers are the outcome of the labors and discussions of the seminar, and give interesting evidence of the method, range, and freedom of its work under the kindly inspiration of Professor Sanday's leadership. The reviewer's task is at once embarrassed and facilitated by the fact that in the introduction (pp. vii–xxvii) Dr. Sanday has himself reviewed the book, discussing each essay with a delightful combination of courtesy and candor. Here, even more perhaps than in his own essay, Professor Sanday reveals some of his conclusions about synoptic matters; he is pleased that Sir John Hawkins urges the connection of Q with the Logia of Papias; he doubts whether Mark was ever issued without 6:45—8:26 and chap. 13. Streeter's contention that Mark knew Q Sanday concedes, but with such qualifications that it becomes a very shadowy acquaintance, hardly to be distinguished from independent tradition of the same facts or sayings. Dr. Sanday's references to the two-document hypothesis are altogether favorable, without, however, committing him or his essayists as a group to that popular position. Each paper is preceded by a very convenient summary of its main contents.

In his own essay Dr. Sanday advances the interesting suggestion that as Matthew, Luke, and Acts are in length just about the maximum size of a papyrus roll convenient for use, considerations of space may have

¹ *Studies in the Synoptic Problem.* By Members of the University of Oxford (W. Sanday, Sir John Hawkins, B. H. Streeter, W. C. Allen, J. V. Bartlet, W. E. Addis, N. P. Williams). Edited by W. Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. xxvii+456 pages. 12s. 6d.